



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,084	08/16/2005	Nicolas Drabczuk	09669/043001	4431
22511	7590	07/27/2007		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER SORRELL, ERON J	
			ART UNIT 2182	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,084

Applicant(s)

DRAB CZUK, NICOLAS

Examiner

Eron J. Sorrell

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/27/07 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendment to claims 9 and 10 is sufficient to overcome the 101 rejections set forth in the previous office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2182

4. Claims 1-4, and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,725 hereinafter "Write") in view of Schmisseeur et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0178316 hereinafter "Schmisseeur").

5. Referring to method claim 1, system claim 8, apparatus claim 9, and computer readable storage medium claim 10, Wright teaches a system and method of configuring a system comprising a main device (item 102 in figure 1) and an auxiliary device (item 100 in figure 1) arranged to co-operate with each other, the main device being arranged to handle one or more functionalities, the auxiliary device being arranged to effect one or more functionalities (see lines 24-40 of column 3);

wherein the method comprises an adaptation step, in which the auxiliary device performs a first enumeration of its functionalities to the main device (see items 204 and 206 in figure 4);

Wright fails to teach the method further comprises an enumeration step in which the auxiliary device performs a second enumeration of its functionalities to the main device, wherein the second enumeration hides from the main device at least those of its functionalities for which the main device is not arranged to handle.

Art Unit: 2182

Schmisseur teaches, in an analogous system and method wherein functionalities of an auxiliary device are enumerated to a main device, an enumeration step in which the auxiliary device performs a second enumeration of its functionalities to the main device, wherein the second enumeration hides from the main device at least those of its functionalities for which the main device is not arranged to handle (see paragraph 25, note the host receives the second enumeration information from the peripheral device and some of the functionalities are concealed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Wright with the above teachings of Schmisseur. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to conceal device functions not supported by the host as suggested by Schmisseur (see paragraph 28).

6. Referring to claim 2, Wright a notification step, in which the auxiliary device notifies the main device of a set of data corresponding to the first enumeration of the functionalities that the auxiliary device can effect (see item 206 and 210 in figure 4). Wright fails to teach an identification step, in

Art Unit: 2182

which the set of data is used to identify the functionalities that the auxiliary device can effect but that the main device cannot handle and a configuration step, in which the auxiliary device is configured to hide for the second enumeration from the main device at least those of its functionalities that the main device cannot handle.

Schmisseur teaches the above limitations (see paragraph 25, note the I/O processor indicates the functions to conceal from the host, so when the second enumeration of the peripheral device occurs the concealed functions are not detected by the host).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Wright with the above teachings of Schmisseur for the same reasons as mentioned above.

7. Referring to claim 3, the combination of Wright and Schmisseur the adaptation step is followed by the enumeration step, in which the auxiliary device presents itself to the main device without the functionalities identified in the identification step (see Schmisseur paragraph 23, the peripheral device being presented without the concealed functions is the final step).

8. Referring to claim 4, Wright teaches the adaptation step is carried out automatically when connecting the auxiliary device to the main device (see paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5, note there is no user intervention after the device is connected to the host).

9. Referring to claim 6, Wright teaches the main device is a USB host and the auxiliary device is a USB device (see lines 6-23 of column 3).

10. Referring to claim 7, Wright teaches that the auxiliary device may be a smartcard (see lines 33-52 of column 4, note one of the interfaces is a smart card interface).

11. Referring to claims 11,13,15, and 17, Wright teaches the functionalities are service available on the auxiliary device (see lines 31-37 of column 1, note the capabilities of the device are being construed as the services offered by the device).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Schmisser as applied to

Art Unit: 2182

claims 1-3,8,9, and 10 above, and further in view of Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,834 hereinafter "Williams").

13. Referring to claim 5, the combination of Wright and Schmisser teaches the method of claim 3 as shown above, however the combination fails to teach a simulation step is carried out between the adaptation step and the enumeration step, in which the disconnecting and the reconnecting of the auxiliary device is simulated.

Williams teaches, in a system wherein a device performs a first and second enumeration step, simulating a disconnect and reconnect of the auxiliary device (see items 420 and 440 in figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Wright and Schmisser with the above teachings of Williams so the user does not have to physically disconnect and reconnect the device to get it to enumerate itself again.

14. Claim 12,14,16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Schmisser as applied to claims 11,13,15, and 17 above, and further in view of



Art Unit: 2182

Shmueli et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0147912 hereinafter "Shmueli").

15. Referring to claims 12,14,16, and 18, the combination of Wright and Schmisser teaches the method, system, and apparatus of claims 11,13,15, and 17 above, however the combination fails to teach at least one of the services is required to run an application on the main device.

Shmueli teaches, in a system wherein USB device is connected to a host, the above limitation (see paragraph 26, note a start-up application is stored on the peripheral, and when the peripheral is connected to the host applications on the host can run).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the combination of Wright and Schmisser with the above teachings of Shmueli. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to make such modification in order to provide the device with privacy and security measures as suggested by Shmueli (see paragraph 22).

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

1) Wright fails to teach the auxiliary device providing a listing of services (i.e. functionalities) to the main device (see first paragraph on page 8);

2) Schmisser teaches the I/O processor does not enumerate its own functionality; rather the I/O processor enumerates the functionality of a separate peripheral device to which is it connected (see 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph of page 9).

17. **As per argument 1, the Examiner disagrees.** There is no limitation that requires sending a listing of services, only an enumeration of its functionalities is required. Wright clearly teaches this limitation. At column 1, lines 31-38, Wright teaches the enumeration process includes the peripheral devices alerting the host of its requirements and **capabilities** (emphasis added). These "capabilities" are being construed as applicant's "functionalities".

18. **As per argument 2, the Examiner disagrees.** At paragraph 25, Schmisser teaches the I/O processor performs a first and subsequent enumeration procedure. The I/O processor's

Art Unit: 2182

functionalities are limited by the functionalities of the connected devices (i.e. the I/O processor cannot carry out functions that are not supported by the connected devices), thus when the I/O processor enumerates to the host its functionalities, its both the functionalities of the I/O processor and the connected devices.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J. Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on 571-272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EJS

July 10, 2007

 7/10/07